

## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### REGION VIII

999 18th STREET - SUITE 500 DENVER, COLORADO 80202-2466



000020093

OCT - 1 1992

Ref: 8HWM-FF

Mr. Frazer Lockhart Department of Energy Rocky Flats Office P.O. Box 928 Golden, CO 80402-0928

re: OU 1 Wetlands Mitigation

Dear Mr. Lockhart:

Your September 14, 1992, letter that discusses additional planting within the confines of the wetland area has been reviewed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The enclosed memo and drawing specifies in more detail the placement of plantings that will be necessary for final approval of this plan. Additionally, DOE must specify in more detail the areas from which vegetative material will be collected and the proposed collection densities. As stated in the memo, a five year monitoring plan is also needed to verify and characterize the wetland.

If you have any questions regarding these matters, please contact Gary Kleeman at 294-1071.

Sincerely,

Martin Hestmark, Manager Rocky Flats Project

Enclosure

cc: Rich Schassburger, DOE

R. Flory, EG&G



## UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

#### **REGION VIII**

# 999 18th STREET - SUITE 500 DENVER, COLORADO 80202-2466

Ref: 8WM-WQ

### MEMORANDUM

TO:

Bill Fraser

FROM:

Bradley Miller

COPY:

Gary Kleeman

RE:

Comments on the September 14, 1992 Letter from DOE Addressing Wetland Mitigation for the French Drain

Impacts at Rocky Flats

DATE:

September 21, 1992

On September 3, 1992, I met with in the field with representatives of DOE, EG&G, and EPA concerning the mitigation plan outlined in DOE's letter dated August 18, 1992. At this meeting, I discussed the minimal elements of a mitigation plan which would be acceptable to EPA.

As stated in the latest DOE letter on wetland mitigation, I do not oppose the plugging of the culvert which exits the proposed wetland mitigation area to allow water levels and the related water table to rise in the area. We discussed at some length the advantages of such work and various methods of accomplishing this. We also discussed the need for such work to verify the elevation of water which will be retained within the mitigation area to determine the new limits of soil saturation for the edge of the wetland mitigation area. Without this kind of information, it is impossible for me to determine the number of plants needed or to verify the mitigation plan described in DOE's latest letter meets my minimal criteria for approval.

I have developed a mitigation planting plan based on the map of area which was part of the September 3, 1992 letter from DOE. I have drawn various areas of cattail, willow, and upland tree and grass planting. This map is attached for your reference. The willows are intended to be planted in two rows around the periphery of the wetland in staggered rows on nominal three foot centers such that the cut ends of the willows will be within the zone of soil saturation. The mitigation plan must also include a monitoring plan to verify the continued existence of the areal extent of wetland and characterize the overall health and the ability of the wetland to perform its functions. The monitoring plan should be implemented for at least five years with

maintenance being performed, as necessary, to achieve the mitigation goals. In addition to the reporting portion of the monitoring plan identified above, the plan should include photographs taken from set locations in set directions showing the wetland mitigation area.

Provided DOE agrees with the attached design of the mitigation plan, the areas of vegetative material collection are identified, the collection densities are specified and are acceptable, and the monitoring and maintenance provisions listed above are included, I see no reason why I would not recommend approval of the wetland mitigation plan.

attachment

